

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION ON HIV HEALTH SERVICES

3530 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1140 • Los Angeles, CA 90010 • TEL (213) 738-2816 • FAX (213) 637-4748

While not required of meeting participants, signing-in constitutes public notice of attendance. Presence at meetings is recorded solely based on sign-in sheets, and not signing-in constitutes absence for Commission members. Only members of the Commission on HIV Health Services are accorded voting privileges, thus Commissioners who have not signed in cannot vote. Sign-in sheets are available upon request.

COMMISSION ON HIV HEALTH SERVICES ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES November 15-16, 2004



DAY 1: NOVEMBER 15, 2004				
MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS PRESENT (cont.)	PUBLIC	COMM STAFF/ CONSULTANTS	
Al Ballesteros, Co-Chair	John Palomo	Terry Goddard	Virginia Bonila	
Nettie DeAugustine, Co-Chair	Wendy Schwartz	Miki Jackson	Shirley Bowie	
Ruben Acosta	Paul Scott/Richard Hamilton	Sophesias Johnson	Diane Burbie	
Carla Bailey	Vanessa Talamantes	Kevin Lewis	Annie McElroy-Domingo	
Anthony Braswell	Kathy Watt	Ruel Nolledo	Jane Nachazel	
Mark Briggs		Jane Price	Tina Quatro	
Robert Butler		Gary Vrooman	Lisa Ransdell	
John Caranto	MEMBERS ABSENT	Rocio Yong	Sherry Rolls	
Charles Carter			Deborah Silver	
Richard Eastman	Adrian Aguilar		Jim Stewart	
Whitney Engeran	Carrie Broadus	OAPP STAFF	Lisa Sueki	
Hugo Farias	Ruth Davis		Beverly Voran	
Gunther Freehill	Nancy Eugenio	Patty Gibson	Craig Vincent-Jones	
William Fuentes	Michael Gray	Michael Green	Nicole Werner	
John Griggs	Marcy Kaplan	Raymond Johnson		
David Guigni	Anna Long	Rochelle Lloyd		
Charles Henry	Elizabeth Marte	Vicki Nagata		
Rebecca Johnson-Heath	Vicky Ortega	William Strain		
Wilbert Jordan	Chris Perry	Juhua Wu		
Brad Land	Dana Pierce-Hedge			
Michael Lewis	Alexis Rivera			
Andrew Ma	Fontaine Schockley			
Elizabeth Mendia	Fariba Younai			

 REGISTRATION/CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST: Participants convened in the meeting room beginning at 8:00 am, the first day, November 15, 2005.

II. CALL TO ORDER

A. Introductions: Ms. DeAugustine and Mr. Ballesteros called the meeting to order at 8:50 am. Commissioners, staff and audience introduced themselves.

III. AGENDA REVIEW/INTRODUCTION

- **A. Approval of Agenda**: Ms. Burbie reviewed the accompanying agenda item by item with the assembled group, noting in particular the amount of time to be spent in Committee workgroups. Ms. Burbie introduced her consulting staff who would be responsible for working with the various Committees and work groups throughout the two-day period. **MOTION #1**: Agenda Order approved (*Passed by Consensus*).
- IV. **WELCOME**: Mr. Vincent-Jones welcomed the participants and thanked them for the two-day commitment. He reiterated that the theme of the Annual Meeting, CARE Act Reauthorization, is central to the core mission of the planning council, as well as its administrative mechanism partners.
 - **A. Review of Accomplishments:** Ms. DeAugustine and Mr. Ballesteros read the preceding year's accomplishments, acknowledging that the Commission's separation from DHS culminated several years of hard work and perseverance, but that there had been many other significant achievements preceding and following the separation. The list of accomplishments was included in the Annual Meeting work materials, and were posted around the room
- V. **GREETINGS**: Official greetings from other parties were postponed to the second day.
- VI. PUBLIC COMMENT, NON-AGENDIZED: There was no non-agendized public comment.
- VII. COMMISSION COMMENT, NON AGENDIZED: There was no non-agendized Commission comment.

VIII. LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

- A. Ryan White CARE Act: Ms. Schwartz and Mr. Engeran introduced the CARE Act in a Powerpoint presentation, and led the participants through a brief description of its central features and elements, addressing the variations between all Titles and their specific purposes and funding strategies. Mr. Freehill helped clarify the formula and other criteria used to determine different Title funding awards.
- **B.** Ordinance 3.29: Mr. Butler led the group in a Powerpoint presentation regarding the various aspects of the Commission's governing Ordinance, noting in particular where it linked to the CARE Act, differences between County and CARE Act requirements and mandates, and illustrating some of the expected changes in the upcoming Ordinance revision.
- **C. Key Principles**: Ms. Burbie and Ms. Watt introduced the "Key Principles" that would frame the two-day discussion about Reauthorization, drafted by the Annual Meeting working group. They detailed the process the working group engaged to determine the principles and the steps in that process.

X. REVIEWING THE KEY PRINCIPLES

- **A. Discussion and Understanding**: Ms. Burbie and her consulting staff led four simultaneous small group discussions, not by Committee, about two of the eight Key Principles that each group had been assigned. The participants reconvened at the end of the session to begin summarizing their understanding of the Key Principles assigned to them, the need for the principles, and the small group's discussions that ensued. **Attachment A** further details the Key Principles and related discussions.
- XII. **PARADIGMS/OPERATING VALUES**: Ms. Burbie and the Annual Meeting working group discussed the process for the selection of paradigms and operating values that would ultimately be used to help facilitate decision-making during the two-day Reauthorization meeting. The Paradigms selected were: Utilitarianism, Merit and Absolute Inclusiveness; the Operating Values were Openness/Transparency, Representation and Advocacy (further detailed in **Attachment A**).
- XIII. **EMBRACING THE KEY PRINCIPLES**: Ms. Burbie led a large group discussion about how the Key Principles would shape the final Commission Reauthorization strategy and policy.

XV. REVIEWING AND PRIORITIZING ISSUES

- A. Instructions and Directions: Ms. Burbie described the next day's activities and outlined the mechanism that would be used to help the Commission move from Key Principles to an actual Reauthorization policy statement. Ms. Burbie pointed the group's attention to a list of issues—developed by staff and Annual Meeting working group members—that had been raised during the course of nationwide Reauthorization conversations in the preceding six months. Ms. Burbie indicated that the list attempted to categorize the issues by Key Principle or other, but was not concrete, and should serve to initiate and direct conversations, but not conclude them.
- **B.** Committee Discussion: The group broke into Committees, which individually began discussing which items/issues raised as a result of the Key Principles discussion(s) the Committee felt it important to address in the next day. The Committees adjourned themselves, in preparation to reconvene as the larger group the next day.

DAY 2: NOVEMBER 16, 2004				
MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS PRESENT (cont.)	PUBLIC	COMM STAFF/ CONSULTANTS	
Al Ballesteros, Co-Chair	Vanessa Talamantes	Miki Jackson	Virginia Bonila	
Nettie DeAugustine, Co-Chair	Kathy Watt	Sophesias Johnson	Shirley Bowie	
Ruben Acosta		Kevin Lewis	Diane Burbie	
Carla Bailey		Luis Lopez	Annie McElroy-Domingo	
Mark Briggs	MEMBERS ABSENT	Davyd McCoy	Jane Nachazel	
Carrie Broadus		Michael Sullivan	Tina Quatro	
Robert Butler	Adrian Aguilar	Gary Vrooman	Lisa Ransdell	
John Caranto	Anthony Braswell	Rocio Yong	Sherry Rolls	
Charles Carter	Ruth Davis		Deborah Silver	
Richard Eastman	Nancy Eugenio		Jim Stewart	
Whitney Engeran	Charles Henry	OAPP STAFF	Lisa Sueki	
Hugo Farias	Rebecca Johnson-Heath		Beverly Voran	
Gunther Freehill	Wilbert Jordan	Patty Gibson	Craig Vincent-Jones	
William Fuentes	Marcy Kaplan	Raymond Johnson	Nicole Werner	
David Guigni	Anna Long	William Strain		
John Griggs	Elizabeth Marte	Juhua Wu		
Brad Land	Vicky Ortega			
Michael Lewis	Chris Perry			
Andrew Ma	Dana Pierce-Hedge			
Elizabeth Mendia	Alexis Rivera			
John Palomo	Fontaine Schockley			
Wendy Schwartz	Fariba Younai			
Paul Scott/Richard Hamilton				

I. **REGISTRATION/CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST**: Commissioners and participants began converging in the meeting room at 8:15 am.

II. CALL TO ORDER

A. Introductions: Ms. DeAugustine and Mr. Ballesteros called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. Commissioners, staff and audience introduced themselves.

III. AGENDA REVIEW/INTRODUCTION

A. Approval of Agenda: Ms. Burbie reviewed the agenda and outline of activities for the second day. **MOTION #2**: Agenda Order approved (*Passed by Consensus*).

IV. GREETINGS

- On behalf of the Commission, Mr. Vincent-Jones welcomed Doug Morgan, Director, Division of Service Systems (DSS), HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB), and Johanne Messore, LA County's Title I Project Officer, on a conference call with the group.
- Mr. Morgan thanked the Commissioners for their commitment to the planning council and its efforts. He noted that it takes much dedication for a group as large as the Commission to convene for two days in order to enhance its decision-making and understanding of the CARE Act. He further stressed the importance of planning councils and their work to local continuums of care, and to the successful implementation of CARE Act interests throughout the country.
- In response to a question, Mr. Morgan indicated that while several national and local groups were developing their policy statements about Reauthorization, very little had yet been released nor decided on. He pointed out that the IOM report initiated some dialogue about Reauthorization, acknowledged that the CAEAR Coalition and AIDS Action would be developing a combined report, and that NASTAD was leading discussions about how funds are distributed nationally. He added that he Joint CDC/HRSA Advisory Committee had released their recommendations, and that there were efforts internally at HRSA to begin considering the issues raised by the Advisory Committee and others, and to plan how to advise the decision-making process.
- Mr. Vincent-Jones recognized Jo Messore's extraordinary efforts to help the Commission and the EMA to effectively implement Title I locally. He added that some Project Officers acted as adversaries and others acted as partners, and Ms. Messore's collaborations were the model of partnership. Mr. Morgan expressed appreciation for the comments, for Ms. Messore's work, and noted that he, too, prefers the partnership model, and it is increasingly being implemented at HAB.
- Mr. Morgan was asked about the appropriate role that planning councils can play in advocacy efforts. He responded that planning councils were meant to be advocates, and they are an integral component in the equation advocating for funding and various local responses/resources. He went on to say that planning councils are not allowed to "lobby", but they can "educate" and "inform" various partners and stakeholders, including legislators. He further recommended that planning councils could do so in coordination with coalitions and advocacy groups, and suggested that planning council funds might even be allowed to be used to join those types of coalitions—but noting that he would have to check on that.
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT, NON-AGENDIZED: There was no non-agendized public comment.
- VI. COMMISSION COMMENT, NON AGENDIZED: There was no non-agendized Commission comment.

VII. REVIEWING AND PRIORITIZING ISSUES

- **A.** Consolidating Committee Results: The Committee working groups concluded their identification and prioritization of Reauthorization-related issues, and prepared them for discussion in the large group.
- **B.** Discussion and Consensus: Ms. Burbie led the assembled Commissioners through a large group discussion detailing the various individual items that Committees had raised/evaluated and/or identified for further Commission discussion.

XI. ITEMIZING REAUTHORIZATION ISSUES

- **A. Discussion and Consensus**: Ms. Burbie led the assembled Commissioners through a process to prioritize and elaborate on the prioritized issues in the context of the Key Principles. A small group including Commissioners, staff and others worked outside the main discussion center developing the formal written Reauthorization policy statement.
- XIII. **STRATEGIZING/COMMUNICATING THE POLICY**: The design of the communication plan was postponed in order to give fuller attention to the remaining Reauthorization issues and priorities that needed to be addressed.

Commission Annual Meeting Minutes

November 15-16, 2004 Page 5 of 5

- XIV. **ADOPTING THE POLICY**: Because the meeting lost its margin of a quorum, the Commission agreed to open the draft policy (**Attachment B**) for a 30-day public comment period, as the first step in the communication process. The Commission agreed to then flesh out the descriptions of the issues, and present it for consideration and adoption at its December and/or January meetings.
- XV. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**: Ms. Burbie asked that all Commissioners and other participants complete their evaluations of the meeting, its contents and related activities. The results of the evaluation are detailed in **Attachment C**.
- XVI. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm, on Day 2, November 16, 2005.